

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,688	03/09/2004	Norris E. Warner	P-124923.1	2637
7590 10/19/2004			EXAMINER	
Thomas E. Sisson			NICOLAS, FREDERICK C	
JACKSON WA	LKER L.L.P.			
Suite 2100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
112 E. Pecan Street			3754	
San Antonio, TX 78205			DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		Appl	ication No.	Applicant(s)	V				
Office Action Summary		10/7	96,688	WARNER ET AL	1				
		Exam	niner	Art Unit					
			erick C. Nicolas	3754	-				
The Period for Re	MAILING DATE of this communications in the plant of the p	cation appears o	n the cover sheet t	with the correspondence a	ddress				
THE MAIL - Extensions of after SIX (6) - If the period - If NO period - Failure to regard Any reply regions	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC of time may be available under the provisions of MONTHS from the mailing date of this common for reply specified above is less than thirty (30 for reply is specified above, the maximum stated by within the set or extended period for reply verived by the Office later than three months after the maximum and the term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In unication. days, a reply within the tutory period will apply will, by statute, cause the	no event, however, may a ne statutory minimum of th and will expire SIX (6) MC ne application to become a	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered tim DNTHS from the mailing date of this ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)⊠ Resp	consive to communication(s) filed								
· <u></u>	, 								
·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition o	f Claims								
4a) C 5) ☐ Clair 6) ☑ Clair 7) ☐ Clair 8) ☐ Clair									
Application P	apers								
·	specification is objected to by the			·					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 March 2004</u> is/are: a) accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119								
12)☐ Ackno a)☐ All 1.☐ 2.☐ 3.☐	owledgment is made of a claim f	documents have documents have of the priority doc nal Bureau (PCT	been received. been received in cuments have bee	Application No In received in this Nationa	l Stage				
Assaulturent									
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of Re	eferences Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Dr 3) Information	aftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F //Mail Date		Paper No	o(s)/Mail Date. Informal Patent Application (PT	O-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/796,688 Page 2

Art Unit: 3754

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "22" has been used to designate both aerosol spray can and trigger lever (see Figure 4). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

 Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 1, line 7, it appears that the claimed limitation "said hammer" lacks proper antecedent basis.
 Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3754

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smrt 3,485,206.

Smrt discloses an apparatus for mounting an aerosol spray can (11) having a push-button (14) as seen in Figure 1, which comprises a handle (15) having a first coupling end (16,17), a second body end (37), a can base support (18) attached to the handle, a body member (23) attached to the second end of the handle, a trigger lever (22) pivotably attached to the body member, the lever having first (26) and second arms (25), a trigger yoke (29) for pivotably supporting a trigger hammer (31), the hammer aligned with the push-button when the aerosol can is supported in the can base support, an actuator member (33) attached to the first arm of the lever whereby movement of the actuator pivots the lever engaging the hammer, the hammer depressing the push button as seen in Figure 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 2,4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smrt 3,485,206 in view of Hickson 3,856,209.

Smrt has taught all the features of the claimed invention except that an extension pole connectable to a coupling end of the handle. Hickson teaches the use of a handle

Application/Control Number: 10/796,688

Art Unit: 3754

(11) having a coupling end (15), where an extension pole (14) is connected to the coupling end of the handle (col. 2, II. 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Smrt's first coupling end handle with Hickson's coupling end as taught by Hickson in (col. 2, II. 24-28), in order to provide a relatively long handle which is in two sections and removably held together by a ferrule.

With respect to claim 4, the claimed limitation "said first and second arm are disposed at an angle in the range of 91°.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the first and second arm to be disposed at an angle in the range of 91°, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. As per MPEP 2144.05

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smrt 3,485,206.

Smrt has taught all the features of the claimed invention except that said first and second arm are disposed at an angle in the range of 91°-101°.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the first and second arm to be disposed at an angle in the range of 91°-101°, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. As per MPEP 2144.05

Art Unit: 3754

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Drew 6,789,705, Orozco 6,390,336, Smrt 4,099,482, Yoshitomi 4,886,191, Lee 4,089,440, Meuwly 3,039,657, Bishop 3,017,056, Bedore et al. 5,307,959, Wentzell 3,861,566 and Silva 3,716,195 disclose other types of apparatus for mounting an aerosol spray can.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frederick C. Nicolas whose telephone number is (703)-305-6385. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Y Mar, can be reached on 703-308-2087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FN October 18, 2004

Frederick C. Nicolas Patent Examiner Art Unit 3754

10/18/04